

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800, Sears Tower Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice) 312-454-0411 (fax) www.cmap.illinois.gov

Land Use Committee Meeting Notes

Wednesday, January 16, 2008

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

DuPage County Conference Room

Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois

Members Present:

Mark Avery (Chair), Sam Assefa, Alan Bennett, Jerry Conrad, Roger Dahlstrom, Michael Davidson, David Dubois, David Galowich, Tam Kutzmark (for Ken Johnson), Jim LaBelle, Ed Paesel (Vice Chair), Dennis Sandquist, Heather Smith, Heather Tabbert, Kai Tarum, Nancy Williamson, Norm West

Staff Present:

Erin Aleman, Janet Bright, Bob Dean, Lee Deuben, Kristin Heery, Don Kopec, Stephen Ostrander, Ylda Pineyro, Brian Rademacher, Joy Schaad, Ty Warner

Others Present:

Anja Claus, Center for Humans & Nature; Theresa Frankiewicz, Crown Community Development; Paul Heltne, Center for Humans & Nature; Mike Klemens, Will County Governmental League; Frank Kozak, Village of Schaumburg Plan Commission; Dan McLaughlin, Patrick Engineering; Chad Pannucci, Centex Homes; Mike Walczak, Northwest Municipal Conference

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Meeting Notes – November 14, 2007

A motion to approve the minutes of the November 14th, 2007 meeting, as presented, was made by Dahlstrom and seconded by Bennett. All in favor the motion carried.

4.0 Legislative Update

Governor Blagojevich made an amendatory veto to H.B. 656 allowing for free rides to senior citizens. The bill now goes back to the House and Senate for a vote.

The Committee discussed the gas tax and the discrepancies in collar counties and their authority to collect taxes. (Both Lake and Will do not have authority to implement a gas tax, as the Governor vetoed their ability to have a referendum on the issue.)

No vote is required by County Boards for the 0.25% tax. An RTA meeting is being called tomorrow morning for a resolution that authorizes collection (through the Department of Revenue) of that 0.25% - this is the last action needed before those funds can be allocated, and then it should be effective April $1^{\rm st}$.

5.0 Committee Member Overview: *David Galowich, Urban Land Institute*

The Urban Land Institute (National: http://www.uli.org, Local: http://chicago.uli.org) shares information and experience, showcases new projects and examine trends and innovations in the greater Chicago area.

Theresa Frankiewicz, Crown Community Development, is the Chair of the Chicago chapter's Executive Committee and joined the Land Use Committee for this meeting. The Chicago chapter has about 1200 members and one full-time staff person locally. ULI provides technical assistance to communities through several initiatives the one that they are known for are their technical assistance panels. Recently ULI had a technical assistance panel in Wilmette.

ULI has other technical assistance programs such as their Planning Commissioner training and an "Urban Plan" program for high school and college students, as well as a Product Council program. (Warner said CMAP has been aware of the ULI online training as it plans its series of Planning Commissioner Training workshops for 2008, and will find ways to link to ULI 's resources.)

The national ULI program started in San Francisco. Product Councils have been developed for large scale products where feedback and discussion can take place among the development community.

6.0 Developments of Regional Importance

Avery relayed that the Subcommittee task force on DRIs has met twice. The last meeting was just before Christmas and next meeting will be January 29 at 3:00pm. This may be the last meeting of this subcommittee. The EJ&E acquisition of CN has been the test case for DRI. The acquisition will create an increase in freight traffic 3-5 times today's levels in some communities. It has also been suggested that this acquisition will free up between 400-500 acres of land for development. DRI broad/generic language in legislation is both good and bad news for CMAP. Many of the Planning Liaisons have attended the subcommittee's meetings.

Tam Kutzmark asked how the EJ&E evaluation will help define the scope of DRIs and the process.

Norm West asked how information will be gathered, because CMAP may never know if they have all the information. Also, has the committee been developing triggers?

Chair Mark Avery expressed that there will always have to be some subjective determination.

David Galowich commented on the issue of applicability to public and/or private development. He feels the Florida system is broken - each county has their own trigger thresholds. This has led to finger-pointing over who will do improvements. CMAP needs to develop criteria on what will get submitted and a timeline.

Ed Paesel noted that firstly there is a limited amount of CMAP staff to do these and secondly that CMAP should not only look at the negative impacts of a project, but also at the potentialities (e.g., new intermodal facilities that may open up with EJ&E).

Terri Frankiewicz, ULI, commented on Florida's experience when they instituted something similar. The Florida process has resulted in two-year approval time, can add up to \$740 million to project cost, and has resulted in patchwork development without connectedness as developments try to stay under the threshold.

Dennis Sandquist asked what is the process for notification of DRI? Will the developer come to CMAP? Is the host community responsible for this? He said the cutoffs need to vary by region and suggests that CMAP bring the regional perspective to the community as opposed to everyone coming downtown.

The Committee wants the DRI issue to come back to Land Use Committee, as several members stated they believe this committee has an optimal makeup of participants to work with this issue.

Alan Bennett stated that in Elmwood Park 121 trains/day across Grand Ave (mostly Metra)

Mike Davidson asked (1) what the consequences are of CMAP's approval or disapproval, and (2) to what extent is this tied in with the plan? Bob Dean answered that the plan tie-in is through the alignment of indicators. CMAP doesn't have the authority to approve or disapprove projects, DRI are an evaluation process rather than approval process.

Paul Heltne asked, (1) is there a process for citizen nomination of projects? (2) Water supply, air quality, environmental corridors - all have to figure into this; (3) what is of regional impact; what can we really say about this? This last especially is a bigger question without a short answer.

Don Kopec said that CMAP is looking at EJ&E as a candidate to tease out issues, but it is not a typical DRI. The process is far from being in place. Sub-committee discussion notes will be placed online.

Jim LaBelle said there are a hierarchy of impacts, and the Regional Planning Act is both regional and intergovernmental. There are some developments the neighboring community should know about, and this may not have to happen at CMAP, but CMAP should facilitate that notice, not in a regulatory aspect but simply in ensuring transparency. Certainly big projects are important, but there is another level of project that is not reviewed and should be.

Don Kopec stated we are looking at a two-phase approach: first, how do you find DRIs and/or what is the trigger for them. Secondly, CMAP is going to be looking at indicators and thresholds.

Roger Dahlstrom relayed that an event begins a process. How will that event fit into the plan we've come to support?

Mike Davidson expressed that the legislation states CMAP can offer incentives, and this could be used to affect DRIs.

Norm West believes that the EJ&E impact is greater than the 450 acres identified when you consider the entirety of the project. Our partners and the Land Use Committee members can help be the ears of the community to bring projects to CMAP. CMAP alone does not have the resources to consider this.

David Gallowich stated it would be good for us to identify issues and get out of the way. CMAP should inform the region and be a transparent information flow.

Norm West said the Land Use Committee is part of the nexus for these connections up and down the chain.

Jim LaBelle said that the burden is on the host to notify friends and neighbors, as written in legislation. Maybe CMAP should use counties as partners?

Ed Paesel said that projects we decide to fund should also need to follow the DRI process. We need to put our money where our mouth is.

Joy Schaad indicated that the next hearing on the EJ&E acquisition will be in Chicago on January 22 at the Crown Plaza ballroom, 733 W Madison, 1-4pm and 6-8pm. Comments are due Feburary 1st, 2008.

7.0 Committee Charge

Mark Avery had drafted a committee charge, which was then distributed to the Committee. The Committee is to offer their comments by email, and then this will be addressed at the next meeting.

8.0 Regional Comprehensive Plan

Bob Dean indicated these items were not time-sensitive and could be tabled until the next meeting.

9.0 Other Business

Mark Avery acknowledged several people in attendance who are interested in the work of Land Use Committee and how they could contribute to it.

10.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

11.0 Next Meeting

The Committee decide to forego a committee member overview in February. The Regional Comprehensive Plan items (8.0) that were tabled today should come early in the agenda in February. That discussion will include indicators development, strategy research and the Jobs-Housing Balance Snapshot. The Committee will also continue its discussion on developments of regional importance and address the draft Committee Charge. There was agreement that members should allow for the meeting to go to 11:30 a.m.

Warner announced the next meeting will be held in CMAP's Cook County room due to a scheduling conflict on February 20th. While it is a larger room, the Cook room is unfortunately not available on a regular basis for the year. However, as the group has expanded, the DuPage room can be expanded as well to accommodate a greater number of participants.

12.0 Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Bennett and was seconded by Galowich. All in favor the motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ty Warner AICP

Staff Committee Liaison